

Foreign Assistance Series

DALE D. CLARK

Interviewed by Robert Zigler

Initial interview date: October 14, 1998

Copyright 2010 ADST

Q: Dale Clark, welcome to this interview and we'll begin to proceed. Now, could you tell me a little bit about your childhood time because you come from a far off state in the Union and you're not an East Coaster and that kind of thing?

CLARK: Well, my birthday was 1910, August 23. I was born in Salt Lake City and I grew up in Farmington, Utah, a small farming town. I was a Four-H kid and grew the crops that were grown in that area. I did my high school at Kaysville, Utah, Davis High School, then proceeded to the University of Utah.

Q: At the University of Utah, what was your area of study at that time?

CLARK: My area of study was history and political science. I might indicate that I had an early start on that back in high school, an interest in international relations. They had an oratorical contest there and my entry was "The Thralldom of the Sword." I won. My parents, particularly my mother, were very much interested in international relations.

At the University of Utah, I was quite active in student affairs. I joined a good fraternity, mainly I'm afraid on the basis of the fame that I had received in high school as a champion onion grower. This was a widely publicized event that was distributed all over America and netted me a proposal of marriage from a girl in Jeanerette, Louisiana that I never did meet. Somebody used my name and generated a correspondence relationship carried on without my knowledge. That's a little aside.

My college was interrupted by a two and a half or three year period as a missionary for my church. I went to Germany where I learned the German language. At the close of that missionary experience, I traveled. I rode a bicycle from one end of Germany to the other visiting many newspaper editors along the way. Then, I proceeded to the Scandinavian countries and all the way south to Egypt. I had newspaper credentials and as a young newspaper correspondent I was able to interview people in the foreign offices all along the way. Many of the articles I wrote were published in Salt Lake City newspapers.

Q: About when was that? What year?

CLARK: That was 1931-1934, the year of Hitler's triumph. I was living in Berlin when Hitler came to power. I take a little pride in the fact that the things I wrote about Hitler will hold up today just as well as they did then. I was not fooled. However, my viewpoint was one of sympathy for the young Germans with whom I worked. Many of these young people had no hope for the future, and many, even in their 30s never had a job. My feeling was that I could understand why some of them would fall for the Nazi promises and allure and why they could be forgiven for falling for Hitler's promises. I, as an American, with my own background, would have considered Nazism impossible. In my recent visit in Germany I found that the young people I talked to simply could not understand how the youth of the 1930's fell for the Hitler line.

Q: So you went on your bicycle tour up to Scandinavia. Did you come back to the United States and what happened then?

CLARK: I came back to the United States in 1934. I published some newspaper articles and finished up my college degree at the University of Utah. I then went to Washington DC in 1935 when I fell into a hot bed of New Dealers in the Departments of Agriculture. A most stimulating experience. Then, I headed for Columbia University where I got an MA in Government and Public Administration. I studied there with Raymond Moley as one of my professors. He was the head of the "brain trust" in the New Deal revolution. This knowledge came in handy in helping set up a brain trust for the formation of Germany's first post Hitler political party, the Christian Social Union.

The New Deal Brain Trust became, in Munich, G-4, or Gedon Strasse Four. Here, Joseph Mühlner, the organizer of Germany's first free political party after the war, organized his campaign to bring decency back to Germany.

Q: Let's back up here for a moment. You've now graduated from Columbia with an MA. What happened next?

CLARK: I returned to the Department of Agriculture and was assigned to head the Tenant Farmers program in the western five states. Steinbeck's *Grapes of Wrath* tells how this program helped landless migrant refugees from the dust bowl become farm owners.

I then entered Harvard 1939-41 and received a Ph.D. at Harvard.

I must back up a little and indicate that in 1935 when I entered the Department of Agriculture, I was in a general way directed by the Under-secretary, M. L. Wilson.

M. L. Wilson was particularly interested in rural life and the contribution that the small church group could make to the solution of the problems of that day. The migration of the Dust Bowl people to California, for example, uprooted communities and a sense of community needed to be restored. For models, Wilson looked to some of the rural church groups in the Middle West: Mennonites, Brethren and Quakers, and also the Mormons in Utah. Much attention was focused on Brigham Young's settlement of the Great Basin, which they considered one of the most remarkable resettlement feats in all history.

Q: You worked for the Department of Agriculture and then moved on to Harvard to get your doctorate degree there. Your subject and thesis was what?

CLARK: My subject was government and my emphasis was on the same thing I had been doing in the Department of Agriculture: the activating of people in local communities to have an impact on government. The subject of my thesis was *Group Participation in Administration*. The basic idea was that the inevitable centralization of government would throw society out of balance unless you had a compensating increase in activity at the local level.

The institutions that provided this still had to be formed. The man who did this mainly was M. L. Wilson and I was sometimes labeled "ML's boy Friday." There would be formed a whole system of local community action committees in addition to the county agent system. There were conservation service and local committees locally elected, but linked with government.

Q: That being the case, you got your doctorate and what year was that? In those days did you get scholarships or particular awards, or did you have to finance your education independently?

CLARK: After graduating from Harvard I returned to the Department of Agriculture and Security Administration in five western states, including California. This was the Tenant Purchase Program. It's best identified by Steinbeck's volume, *The Grapes of Wrath*. The Okies fled the dust bowl and came into California, and this was a program which took landless people and converted them into farm owners. It was a combination finance program (40 year, long term loans) combined with a system of training. It was called a supervised loan program.

At this time, after Harvard, Pearl Harbor was bombed. I entered the military.

Q: Having completed that, then Pearl Harbor took place and you enlisted. Did you enlist in a particular service with a particular objective? An easy example of this would be that of somebody who wanted to be a flier obviously got involved in the Army Air Force. Did you have a particular involvement of your experience and education as far as your military activity was concerned?

CLARK: I did end up doing just exactly what I wanted to do but it took a little fitting in, maybe a little maneuvering. I started out by going to the recruiting office in Salt Lake City and applied, first, through the regular Army. They said, "No, you'd better go apply for an officer appointment, a commission." So, I was interviewed in San Francisco at the Naval Recruitment Office. I was given a Lieutenant Junior Grade commission and was assigned to the Navy Department, first in the Ordinance Department. Knowing that it would take some time to process the papers for Navy duty, I hurried back to Washington and completed the writing of my PhD theses. My faculty advisor, E. Pendleton Herring, was in Washington. A date for the examination was set. It was to be in Cambridge. I asked him, why don't we have the final oral examination right here in Washington. My brilliant friend, scholar and gentleman thought hard for a few seconds and then pronounced: inasmuch as all your examining professors are here in Washington, I see no reason why we should all get on a train, ride up to Harvard, examine you, and then get on another train and ride back to Washington.

I passed my exam at the Cosmos Club shortly before being sworn in as a Navy officer.

There was a man there that would play a big role in my life. It was known that he would go to Europe. He had been with Herbert Hoover, after World War I. He was a very prominent and fine person. He realized that I had this German- speaking qualification and thought that I should go to Europe. He pretty well knew that that's where he would end up also. I'd followed his work with Herbert Hoover. He had an international career.

I heard recently that he had suggested that I was his protégé. I would be very honored to think that was the case. He did move me to Europe to his office in London. There, initially, I worked with things like floatable docks for the invasion of mainland France. Very soon, however, they moved me into military government and that's where I really belonged.

Q: Military government would be essentially post-war, after the peace. That's when the military primarily did government. Values and experiences would then become important. Is that the way you assessed it?

CLARK: Exactly. Military Government during the period of hostilities prepares plans to supervise and control civil government in occupied areas. It is the transition from armed conflict, by the military, to stable civil administration aimed at furtherance of military objectives but rehabilitation and order. I worked closely with political officers and I was head of Planning Coordination. My activities gradually shifted to the joint operations with the political officers.

Q: What were your activities immediately after the World War II period of hostilities?

CLARK: During that spring and summer of 1946, I began writing a book on military government. It was a protest against the Morgenthau Plan for punitive treatment of Germany. While head of Planning Coordination in the Germany Country unit at Supreme Headquarters, I had been given the order to change the plans from a one-Germany concept to plans for a divided Germany that would be reduced to an agricultural state and put the Red Army in the middle of Europe. I remember one of our food experts, a Jewish refugee from Nazi-tyranny, telling me that it had been calculated that if this plan were continued, it would result in the starvation of eighteen million Germans. He was anti-Nazi, but not anti-people. He was sickened by this strong policy, and so was I.

I managed a trip to Washington and New York to spread the alarm and talked to many influential people. One of them was the great leader against starvation after World War I, namely, Herbert Hoover. He told me, the case must be documented, the facts must be predictable. He firmly instructed me to write a book. I began writing in the spring and summer of 1946.

Events moved swiftly, as the U.S. policy moved from policy of Carthaginian Peace to Lincolnian Peace. The material became outdated. However, a central part of the book was printed as a section of a book authored by "Carl Frederick and others." I wrote the section titled, "Conflicts in Planning at Supreme Headquarters." I participated in some of the planning sessions in Herbert Hoover's penthouse apartment at the Waldorf Astoria, and I became acquainted with his group of close advisors.

The group around Herbert Hoover formulated a very successful plan to help defeat the policies that threatened starvation in Germany. This group, of whom I was a member, planned visits by plane to inspect the situation. There was a dramatic confrontation. General Lucius Clay faced his former commander and was told: "while the American flag flies, there shall be no starvation."

In the fall of 1946 I returned to Harvard as a member of the faculty.

In the spring of 1947, when the new members of the faculty began to wonder who would be invited to return to Harvard next year, my wife, Ruth was asked to serve as head of the political Science Faculty Ladies Club. Soon thereafter a very interesting faculty position was discussed, one that suggested tenure. I had spent my allotted year to become re-acquainted with America and I felt driven to get back to war torn Germany.

At the Graduation ceremony I was gratified to stand by a tree in Harvard Yard and listen to Secretary of State George Marshall turn American policy against the unspeakable policy of continued destruction towards to genuinely American Marshall Plan. I was happy with my decision to return to Germany and be part of the reconstruction.

Q: What was your function when you returned to Germany?

CLARK: Back in Berlin I was assigned to the Civil Affairs Division, headed by Ed Litchfield. General Lucius Clay was Military Governor. I quickly joined forces with my friends who were major players in the German resistance. My activist friend, Rainer Hildebrandt, with the Nazi's out of the way, had turned his attention to stopping the communists. He had organized a group called "Fighting Group Against Inhumanity." I suggested that Civil Affairs Division assist him and was given the green light to be his contact.

Many American know of this pacifist revolutionary. He established a safe house for escapees from the Communist east, also a museum at Checkpoint Charlie, just west of the Berlin wall. He was a link between East and West who gave aid and comfort to anti-Red dissidents. He collected the gear and artifacts connected with escape attempts, both successful and fatal, and he crated the most popular museum in Berlin. I think most of us have friends who have visited the Hildebrandt establishment, the "Museum at Checkpoint Charlie."

Q: How long did you remain in Berlin?

CLARK: After a time I was assigned to Bremen, which is a city-state, as Chief, Civil Affairs Division. My first child, Kristina, was born at Bremen-haven. Her name was derived from three names of wonderful friends who lived through the days of the resistance: Christine Bonhoeffer von Dohnanyi, her son Christoph, and Christa Mitzler, daughter of my hero friend, Dr. Josef "Ochsensepp" Mitzler, founder of the CD political party, fir first post-Hitler political party to be formed in Germany.

My office in Bremen had a direct telephone connection to the chief of state. I had an observer's seat in their Bundestag (parliament). I administered Law No. 40, dealing with control of the media, also police, and political parties. I was head of the adoption board. It was government in miniature, a wonderful experience.

Q: After your service in Bremen, what next?

CLARK: In early January, 1949 I moved back to a Civil Affairs Division position in Berlin. I immediately started working to carry out a plan I had been formulating for some time. Through an espionage channel I expressed feelings of friendship for Georg Dertinger, a brilliant political operative who had gone over the East Berlin Communist regime.

I floated an "implied" invitation for him to come "uninvited" to a small dinner party at my residence in Berlin. I expected to be laying the groundwork for a slow build-up of negotiations about the lifting of the Berlin blockade. He surprised me by coming in with a Kremlin approved offer to start immediately, for a gradual, de facto, lifting of the Berlin blockade and a gradual ending of the airlift. This was several months before the battle to save Berlin from starvation by airlift was won. Something went wrong with Dertinger's plan. Something happened in the Kremlin. The hard hand of Lavrentiy Beria to the helm and Dertinger's offering transmitted through me, was repudiated by Beria. Dertinger was sentenced to die.

A funny thing happened to him on his way to the gallows. Lavrentiy Beria, his enemy in the Kremlin, was sitting in a meeting in the Kremlin and someone reached in and shot him dead.

Thus did Georg Dertinger beat the rap. He moved back to the freedom of the American zone.

Q; Who did you work for at this time, army, navy or State Department?

CLARK: This was the OMGUS period (Office of Military Government, U.S.). General Lucius Clay was in command, but the transition to normal civilian government was well advanced.

What happened next? Did you finally get Germany out of your system?

CLARK: No. I returned again to Germany in 1949. This time I came as an itinerant professor for the University of Maryland overseas program. It was a program to give college courses and credit to armed services personnel who were stationed overseas. It was mainly located near airbases. One of my colleagues found himself giving make-up classes in North Africa.

One day - I think it was June 30, 1950 - I went to teach my class in South Ruislip, near an air base next to London. No one was there. They were all headed for Korea for a new war.

A new plan was taking form in my mind. It took root at a regularly scheduled meeting of a "German Brain Trust," held at Josef M¹/₂eller's residence at Gedon Strasse 4 in Munich. (This was an adaptation of the "new Deal Brain Trust" headed by Raymond Moley, a professor of mine at Columbia University). A member of this "G-4" group had suggested that German citizens should form voluntary corps who would repair some of the havoc they had visited on other nations. The suggestion was admirable, but impractical. I soon heard of a better plan. The Point Four Program of President Truman. I decided I wanted to join this program. I resigned my position, teaching international relations and headed for Washington to try to get into the Point Four Program.

Q: When was this?

CLARK: In 1949, I heard about the Point Four Program in Germany. I learned that it was going to be directed toward the undeveloped nations, a transfer of technology to lift them up. As I listened, I decided that's the program I wanted to go into. I came back to the United States with that in mind. Because of my background in the Department of Agriculture, I was picked up there in the interim and assigned to the Foreign Agricultural Service. This organization was in a very real sense the forerunner of Point Four.

In some sense, this program was a prelude to the Point Four Program. Many of the people there moved over to the State Department, including Stanley Andrews. He was head of FAS and later transferred became head of the Point Four Program. I think I was one of the first one hundred to join Point Four. It is very interesting when you look at the big catalogue of the roster they have now, a whole book of names.

There were cases where one man had to have more than one function. I was, for example, head of education for the world and there were two of us in education. Then, I had always taken a liking to the private voluntary agency side of it and that was virtually nonexistent. It had to be resurrected.

The crisis came in Iran. It was in that area that East-West confrontation, the Cold War started. In 1951 I was put in charge of the Iran Office. It was not a division, the Iran Program. It's very interesting from an organizational perspective that in the State Department there were offices for countries and also for functions. Up to this time the various programs in Point Four were run from the offices of the State Department. The Iran crisis changed this. Iran was the first case where, because of its importance as an international crisis point, it became the "Iran Section." I was put in head of it. Dr. Bennett, who was the former president of Arkansas State University (the agricultural university there), was put in as administrator.

Along about Christmas time of 1951, Dr. Bennett and his party of advisors were making a trip around the world looking to the installation of the Point Four offices and programs in virtually each capital. As their plane went in to Tehran, there were bad conditions and a wet field. The plane crashed and everyone was killed.

An interesting incident occurred when I was walking down the hall and somebody almost fainted, and then said, " You?! Still alive?!" It was the first time I realized that I was supposed to have been on that plane.

Plans were made quickly for Stanley Andrews to complete the trip begun by Dr. Bennett. Stanley Andrews had been personally designated by President Truman. The President insisted that this former All-American tackle from the University of Missouri be put in that program. Andrews had been a fighting editor for farmers' rights in the South. He was a great choice. Stanley took me with him. We both had been in military government in Germany.

Q: What countries did you stop in then on that Stanley Andrews trip?

CLARK: We stopped at Rome, the Food and Agriculture Organization; at Malta; the string of countries along North Africa, Cairo, and Lebanon. We went on to Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, India, and Afghanistan.

All the time we were traveling, I thought I was kind of brainwashing Stanley Andrews on what I had learned in the Department of Agriculture about group participation. I particularly mentioned the M. L. Wilson philosophy that the peace groups, the rural groups, could make a contribution. They were very well organized. They had already had great experience overseas. I should have known better than to belabor Andrews because Stanley Andrews himself knew all about these people I had been talking about.

So by the time we arrived at Afghanistan, a program had been formulated. It was decided I would go back to Tehran to try to organize a pilot project using private groups to mount a voluntary program. There was a particular reason for this. If you're going to start a grassroots program, the standard doctrine in all the lectures to follow for years and years was that you've got to have good local leadership.

At Jericho, Jordan we had gone out to the Musa Bey Alami Project. We immediately recognized in Musa Bey Alami a marvelous genius of a leader. He had been the number one civil servant in the old Palestine, scheduled to be Prime Minister with the victory of the Israeli army. He had gone out to the desert there outside of Jericho and started an orphanage. He was having a hard time getting it started. We were so impressed with him that the beginnings of a movement could be built around him. This presented a challenge which we discussed as we traveled.

So by the time we got to Afghanistan it was decided that I would go back to Tehran. The Point 4 Program in Iran was the first, and it had been staffed by a group from the three Utah universities: Utah State, University of Utah, and Brigham Young University. BYU was headed by Franklin S. Harris, who had headed two of these universities. Because of his pioneering prowess, he had been sent by M. L. Wilson and these people who shared this agricultural doctrine. He'd gone over to work on the resettlement of Jewish people in Azerbaijan. So there were two leaders. There was Musa Bey Alami in Jericho and there was Franklin Harris in Tehran.

So I went back to Tehran and a meeting was held. I made the motion that a private, voluntary, non-profit organization be founded. The initial project would be to assist Musa Bey Alami on this Boys Town effort that he was making. Incidentally, it is now said that 6,000 orphan boys have passed through that school and it is still going.

Q: Now, I understand that there were some other things that happened to you, that you did when you were in Iran that had to do with your relationships with the people and the government and things like that. What can you tell about that?

CLARK: Yes, let me talk a little bit more about the Iran situation. I was called in to a strange meeting that was held right at the temporary offices of the Point Four program that we shared right on the mall where we were then located. Reeseman Fryer, who was my superior, said, "Somebody's got to go out to Utah and recruit those three universities and get some contracts and get some people over to Iran, and we want you to go." I said, "When do you want me to go?" and he said, "Yesterday. There's a situation there that demands immediate action." We knew that it was where the Cold War really began. The Russian occupation and withdrawal of their troops and the threat that they might be returned to Iran again.

It was perhaps fortuitous, that a locust invasion threatened Iran. The locusts were on the way from Africa and they had to be combated. We would go in with dusting and spraying airplanes and insecticides. Its very interesting what you can do in a time of crisis and how much fun it is in a time of crisis. There was absolutely no paper work. We called up by telephone chemical places in Denver and told them of the urgency. They put chemicals on airplanes and they were off to Iran without any papers, any signatures, nothing signed. That was the situation.

So I went out to Utah and started with the Brigham Young University because contracts were being negotiated with the land grant college association. This involved, let us say, a little procedure and, perhaps, a little discussion as to who was going to get what. And there was no time for that. Cy Friar, who had preceded me, had gone from Logan, the agricultural college, down to Brigham Young University, said, "We want six men," and before he could get to Washington, we had the names of those six men.

I was told to write a contract by the end of the fiscal year which was virtually on us. Taggart said, "It'll help you if you take a copy of the legislation." I didn't know how to write one of those contracts. I would have done it but the legislation I had helped. I sat down with a little typewriter leaned on a suitcase and typed off a contract. Ernest Wilkinson, president of Brigham Young University, signed it and I took it back to Washington. I made the deadline, just barely. There was an airplane strike. I couldn't depend on airplanes so I took the train a couple of days earlier. When the airplanes resumed, the first airplane to fly, the one I was ticketed for hit a mountain peak, bounced over a mountain peak, and they didn't find it until a year or two later. So I was lucky. I arrived in DC on time with the contract. The Legal Department, I could see, was amused that I had come back with a hand made contract. I was too inexperienced to know that the model contract had been worked over for about a year.

Q: This was in Washington?

CLARK: This was Washington, yes. They were surprised and amused. They polished it up a little bit. However, according to Stanley Andrews, this was the first contract ever signed in this new era of university contracting. Very shortly, the contract for land grant colleges had gone through the necessary levels and concurrences. So, three Utah universities were there. Franklin Harris flew from Tehran to help set up the program pursuant to the contracts. We flew out to Salt Lake City and met with the three college presidents. I learned that they have politics, even in universities. They debated about which institution was to do what. Utah State took agriculture, the University took health and medicine, and BYU took education. And that's the way Gaul was divided into three parts.

Iran was the main focus of this trip. When we arrived at the Iran airport, there were a considerable number of people waiting to greet us. After all, the college contract program had been introduced in Iran and recruits had arrived in Iran from the three principal universities in Utah - University of Utah, Brigham Young University, and the Utah State Agricultural College. Photographs were taken as we stepped from the airplane, and then we were put in the hands of Ardeshir Zahedi and Dr. Franklin S. Harris, chief of the American team of experts serving in Iran. Harris had been the president of two of the universities, Brigham Young University, and Utah State Agricultural College. He was a man admired by M. L. Wilson because he was a genuine pioneer. He had pioneered in the early colonies in Mexico, as a very young man. His parents had taken him there to live. He became an educator and an administrator who had come under M. L. Wilson's attention years earlier. One of his several assignments was to survey of an area in Asia Minor which might be considered as a location for the resettlement of Jewish people.

Now, when I got to Iran, there are some interesting things there that I think have some significance. The communists were, of course, opposed to this intervention. These three universities had covered every province in Iran. They were all over the place, enough so that they could hold church services in Tehran and all over the country. This became a very visible thing.

Stanley Andrews and I were at a reception. William Warne had now arrived on the scene. He was the new man who would represent the State Department replacing Franklin Harris who was there under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Service.

At this reception, we were mysteriously called aside and we were told that a death threat had been made, an assassination threat. There had been an assassination, about a week earlier, of a very high level official, I think it was a cabinet member. So we were advised very soberly. Then, it developed that this news of a threat upon our life had come from five different sources. The way it was put was that the communists (or Tudeh Party) had decided that this would be a good time for an American to be assassinated. "An American" - not two Americans - and so Stanley Andrews and I just stood there and looked at each other. We didn't know who, but it was soon made evident a day or so later. Ardeshir Zahedi brought me a little news sheet, a revolutionary kind of newspaper, a publication from the communist party. He translated. According to this paper, Dale Clark had given Madame Chiang Kai-shek three million dollars. (Laughs) I had just won a popularity contest. It was a type a compliment that I had never had before.

In Tehran, Stanley and I had conferences with some of the economic planners who were trying to usher in a new day for Iran. One thing I remember clearly was that they had paid a great sum for a five-year plan. It was showed to us. It seemed like a whole shelf of bound volumes. I always wondered as I saw these magnificent studies whether I had a little parlor game wagering with myself or anything nearby, whether any of these books had ever been opened. This was the same in Washington and all over. If the administrator were to call you in and say, I want you start a program and get it going, you would be hard-pressed to know what to present in the way of progress. The easiest thing you can do, and it was very often the case, would be to hire one of these studiers of studies to produce a volume for you. Anyone who then asks you, "Have you got started on your program?" you could answer, "Yes, we have a fine group of experts making a study for us." I have talked to the heads of some of these research institutions and they have admitted that in some cases the purpose of a study is for a hard-pressed bureaucrat to gain some time and have some excuse for his existence until he can get his bearings and find out what his job really consists of.

Q: Can you tell us a little about Mr. Zahedi, too?

CLARK: Well, Mr. Zahedi's dad had been the key Iranian general in the revolution that brought the Shah to power. The general had cooperated with a CIA representative over there, who'd engineered the coup that brought in the Shah. Ardeshir, the general's son, had been trained at Utah State University. He had known, of course, President Harris who was now in Iran. Dr. Harris had been advisor to the earlier Shah and was chief of party advising the present Shah. Ardeshir married the daughter of the Shah. He later became the Iranian ambassador to the United States in Washington, where he was quite a notable figure.

The Utah universities personnel were scattered all over Iran, and from everything I've heard they did a remarkable job. They had habits of abstinence that elicited the admiration of the Iranians. They were highly regarded. Yet, there was revolution, and they were kicked out. But the personal relationships have remained very cordial. This group were so taken by the wonderful experience they had in Iran that they have been meeting for 45 years in monthly dinners where they have continued that Iran friendship.

Q: Does that meet up until now?

CLARK: That is up until now and I'm going to interject here something that may belong somewhere else, but the flow probably demands it. The current president of Iran has been indicating through the press that it was time to break down this wall of mistrust between our two countries. I thought that these Utah university people may be a good place to complement him for this move toward friendship that he was taking. I called and was invited to their next meeting. They passed a unanimous resolution to express friendship to President Khomeini and admiration for his stand.

I communicated this to President Khomeini. After all, he addressed not the government but the American people, and I am part of the American people. I sent the letter and received a telephone call from the Iran Mission to the United Nations. Some of those private voluntary agencies such as International Voluntary Services and Heifer Project have been advised.

Q: This was in 1998?

CLARK: This is right now. In fact, the correspondence and the telephone calls are going on at this time. (1999)

Q: Now, there's one thing that we could do on Iran. Do you remember about how many people were there in the 50s? How many are in this group that still meets once a month, the Iran friendship group?

CLARK: I don't remember how many were there, but age has thinned the group out. There are about fifteen in the group around Provo that meet regularly. There are many more up in other areas of the state and in California.

Q: Well, let's go on now to the creation of this non-profit voluntary organization. Maybe you ought to get that on the tape at this time. So, as I remember, you got the idea originally in Iran. Your proposal was to assist Musa Bey Alami there in Jericho, Jordan with someone. Can you talk a little bit about the creation of the organization, how that started and the name of it?

CLARK: Now when I returned from this trip with Stanley Andrews, I felt that I had the go ahead on the voluntary service approach. When I was getting started somebody at Point Four said, "Hey, Clark, these guys that you have been looking for were here." They were identified. I said, "Where are they? Let's find them!" I was afraid I'd missed them, but they were tracked down. It was the Mennonite and the Brethren representatives William Snider and Harold Row and Ben Bushong. I set up a meeting with them with Reeseman Fryer who was a powerhouse, the most dynamic man in the organization.

Q: What did they say then at the meeting?

CLARK: They came to the meeting and said they wanted to have six people "seconded" (a word that they use in their circles quite a bit) to the Point Four Program. "Well," I asked them now, "who have you seen?" Of course I could guess. In big organizations the "treatment" is standardized. Its out of the book. So I said, "I will tell you who you saw, whom he told you to see, what he said, and who he told you to see and what he said." Ben Bushong could see he was taking to a pro, "I didn't know that it was so hard to give something to the government." So, we pointed that you cannot place six men. Sixty, perhaps. There is an old saying: "You cannot get six shovels out of a government warehouse." I picked up this bit of wisdom at the UN. There must be talk in terms of hundreds. So, these visitors from the rural churches began to talk in terms of hundreds.

That was the beginning of the planning of what became International Voluntary Services. Strategy meetings were held in Washington, Philadelphia, New York, Chicago, and Columbus. Fund-raising, organization, personnel, project staffing all of these things were discussed. It was a thoroughly productive and harmonious series of meetings. It was one of the highlights, I think, in the lives of all of us who participated. Harold Row is the one who suggested the name International Voluntary Services. I had some rather dumb name, "foundation" hooked on. I was glad that Harold came up with the real name. It came time, then, to select people and get them on their way.

We started planning for the Musa Alami Project in Jericho. However, as we proceeded to plan, an opportunity, or need, turned up in Assiut, Egypt. World Neighbors cooperated and we started the practice of what we called "hyphenated projects." It became a World Neighbors- IVS project.

One Mennonite young man and another from the Church of the Brethren, Otis Rowe, were recruited. They were the first to actually arrive. The reason it took a little longer to get the Jericho, Jordan thing off ground was the fact that Musa Alami came to America. He wanted to start with a poultry project. We arranged a trip for him down to Broadway, Virginia where the Mennonites are strong in the poultry business.

He came back the most delighted person I think I've ever seen. He said he sat there with those Mennonite leaders and one of them picked up the phone and made a rapid fire series of telephone calls. He oversubscribed the 5,000 chicks that he was after in just a matter of minutes. Then Musa quoted the Mennonite organizer as saying, "Well, you see, we're oversubscribed. Now I won't have to contribute any of my own chicks." (Laughs) (He made a cash contribution.) So the chicks were sent and that was the first project undertaken by IVS.

The first man to go there was Jim Baile from the Church of the Brethren. And there was another one. But this Musa Alami paid great tribute to Jim Baile. He said, "There's never been one before or since that came up to Jim Baile." He described the impact of American attitudes. In Jericho, produce was marketed in a slovenly fashion. The worst stuff was put, as they say, at the bottom of the basket. He said Jim Baile would get in the cargo airplane and he'd say, "You get every box out of here!" and he was ordering people around with authority. There's nobody around here in our own organization that could order people around like Jim Baile, one of the Palestinian foremen said. Jim was right and they knew it and they appreciated the discipline that he was bringing.

Later, a dairy was formed. I had moved to Utah and was managing the bank in my old home town at that time. That was my first experience with Muslim banking. No interest was to be paid on a large deposit account. So I said, "Okay, then I'll give you service." So, I went out and helped get together a herd of cows and recruited the leading dairymen, the Smoots, to go over. The Smoot dairy people, the best dairymen in the state of Utah, were customers of ours at that bank. They met with Musa and Musa selected the one he wanted. Ned Smoot and his wife and a number of others went over and established and ran the dairy. The Ford Foundation made a generous grant for complete dairy facilities.

Q: It should be said that the team of two people in Egypt had an important impact as far as the Peace Corps was concerned. Is that true? Isn't it true that Senator Humphrey went up there and saw them and as a result of that observation then he came back and created the basic legislation for the Peace Corps?

CLARK: The IVS projects were the model for the Peace Corps. That is documented in the Peace Corps legislation itself. Legislation was introduced by Senator Humphrey on December 16, 1960. The Presidential candidates in that election had not yet heard of it. It was not in the campaign. Earlier when Senator Humphrey began a study of what the Peace Corps should be, he sent four men over to the IVS office. They talked to the director Noffsinger. They read action correspondence and the single program statement titled, "Testing the People to People Approach."

Here's an unusual thing. I hate to suggest that this was unusual in the State Department, but there was only one "think piece," only one program statement. Everything else was action paper. This single IVS program statement was an eight page paper called, "Testing the People to People Approach." It described the projects in Egypt, Palestine and Iraq. This was on the letterhead of the International Development Advisory Board. This board, the IDAB, was formed by Nelson Rockefeller. His successor was Eric Johnston, who had been president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce but was currently head of the Motion Picture Association of America. This Board included prominent Americans like industrialists, labor leaders, church leaders, university presidents, and publicists. This board ran interference for the fledgling IVS and helped it pick its way through the bureaucratic mine fields.

And this is something that should be asked: "Why was the International Advisory Board in the picture in the first place?" It's not always easy to get a new idea or a new program started, that is, to put new fuel into old battles. There was difficulty in launching this voluntary program effort from the Point Four Program itself even with Stanley Andrews backing. There were several objections. First, there was the God vs. Caesar impasse, the First Amendment. Government does these economic things and these voluntary agencies do their thing and we do our thing and it was an idea that was shared by both the private agencies and also by the government.

I went up to the National Council of Churches in New York with William Snyder. As I went in one of the prominent churchmen made a kind of a faux pas, Referring to me he said, "Is that the CIA man?" when he meant the ICA, a little Freudian slip there. So we thought that William Snyder should do the talking, rather than "the CIA." Snyder made his speech pointing out that cooperation between government agencies and voluntary agencies was the way to go. However, one of the speakers, a very precise and eloquent minister of the gospel answered him this way: "We have heard William Snyder and his belief that it is possible for the private people, the churches, and the government to have a successful, cooperative, relationship. My experience has been that whenever churches have had a relationship with the government, we have been had."

Q: Now then, this meeting, of course, had some indications. And what are they, do you think?

CLARK: One of the difficulties in launching the IVS idea, the voluntary service idea, had to do with the fact that we were aiming to recruit youth, people that were freshly out of college. There was some opposition to this, and the rebuttal was very well formulated. There were three objections. The first was that young people would not volunteer for this kind of work. Two: if they did volunteer, they wouldn't be competent to do a good job because they were lacking experience. Three: if they were able to do good job, their good work would not be recognized because these pre-industrial societies have high regard for old age.

Now, the opposition that we received among the various divisions on the Point Four Program were such that we needed some heavy weight support. Nelson Rockefeller had formed the International Development Advisory Board, which was now run by Eric Johnston. I was invited to be a member of the staff. Stanley Andrews and I talked a lot about it. He said, "I'd be kind of prayerful about going over there because I've got some things in mind for you here." But, the Advisory Board reported directly to the president and there was a staff member there, very competent. The director, Frank Kimball, was a friend of mine so I went over to the Board.

So the strategy was to enlist the participation of these nationally prominent figures. A couple of committees were formed, one an education committee with three college presidents including John Hannah, the president of Michigan State, who later became the head of the Point Four Program. A committee was appointed that looked over the program of International Voluntary Services.

Of course, these people, they loved it. You know, they were prominent Americans, but a lot of them were farm kids or factory workers in the beginning. They thought this was a great program. It had idealism. It was a Sermon on the Mount type of thing, a road to Jericho kind of thing. We can say that this kind of program was a program born in a manger and, oddly enough, the manger happened to be the boardroom of the Bank of America in San Francisco. This is where the Johnson board, the IDAB, endorsed the International Volunteer Services.

Now, for some time in the beginning, the media cited Eric Johnston as the sponsor of the program. His sponsorship was powerful. His position was strategic. But, Johnson himself knew that the strength flowed in from the grass roots, from rural church groups, these people out in the farming communities, who had been doing this sort of thing all along.

Q: Now then, you have talked a little bit about the creation of the International Voluntary Service as an example of nonprofit organizations or private voluntary organizations working with AID. What else did you do during your career there that would of interest to us? It's my understanding that you were concerned about some, what I will call right now, self financing projects. Can you talk about that a little bit?

CLARK: Rather than attempting to be analytical, I am going to be anecdotal, and relate exactly what happened on one of these pilot projects, a self-financing project was done in Guatemala, and this is how it happened. Some missionaries became very much attached to the people among whom they worked, which is a typical occurrence. And they decided to return and do something to start small business and raise their standard of living. The activities they were going to start were, first, livestock, poultry, and a dairy. They lacked capital and they lacked a system for financing. They did have some experience, and there were friends and relatives, back in Utah that they could call on for help. They needed banking arrangements. One day I called Roy Simmons, who is my favorite banker in Utah, and told him about these young men in Guatemala needing capital.

I indicated that they had relatives willing to put in trust some mortgages, some real estate, as collateral. This asset would be under control of the bank. It would generate credit in Guatemala. This would be a loan guarantee. There are many complex variations.

Now these self-help activities were designed to prove that this people-to-people approach was sounder than the government-to-government approach. But I myself was inside the government, and there were times when my activities were not cheered. I was denied travel authorization, so I simply picked up the phone and put in this call to Roy Simmons. This finally was all handled by a telephone call. This shows how utterly simple it can be. This is significant because there are thousands of banks in America and thousands of banks overseas, and people on both sides of the ocean willing to help.

Now there's another example that I would like to use, and this involves the program that Bishop O'Rourke was involved in in the Philippines. One day it was announced in the Washington office of Point Four that there was going to be a very important staff meeting. A governor of the Philippines had been invited to attend. We discussed his problems in the Philippines and his needs, and there were a very fine group of AID people there and a number of almost brilliant statements were made. But nothing was really going to happen.

Just as the governor was leaving the meeting, I stopped him at the outer door and said, "I'm acquainted with a number of organizations and they can ship high-grade livestock as a basis for a dairy industry." And the governor said pointedly, "Not cows, pigs." "Okay, pigs then," I answered. By that time we got to the outer door (this was about one minute) we had set up a meeting in the pig capital of the world, Des Moines, Iowa. I managed to get out to Iowa, and we planned a program in the Philippines based largely on the work of the Heifer Project people. Breeding stock was shipped to the Philippines and the livestock formed the basis for the financing. There were some very good church representatives over there, representatives for the peace churches, and they were able to make it work.

I was told by a wise teacher that if you are pursuing innovative programs, it is necessary that you be hooked in right at the top. Sometimes I was not hooked in at the top. It happens in government that there are changes in power. New people come in, they don't understand what went before, and sometimes, when they do understand they would like to take it over themselves. And they usually do this by going to a retreat for three days, at one of these places outside of Washington, where they bring their favorite staff people together and they talk it over. There were cases where I had made the original proposal but I would not be invited to the meeting at the retreat, where a new leader was trying to surround what he correctly sensed was a very fine program.

The people-to-people approach was something I was very much committed to and was not going to give up lightly. I had written a thesis at Columbia University, "Economic Democracy in Agriculture." I had followed this up with a Ph.D. thesis at Harvard. And I knew the people in the Administration, the old gang at the Department of Agriculture, and I made this type of approach my goal. So I pursued it by making contacts with Senators and Congressmen on the Hill who could pass legislation and exert influence.

At about this time a program was established whereby staff people from AID would work on the Hill for a time. This was a wonderful opportunity for me. I applied to the Foreign Relations Committee and was accepted, and my papers were being processed to go up to that committee. My friends - I think nearly everyone was on my side - laughed. After being stymied by some new administrators I was now going up to work on this committee that was, in a way, the boss of my present bosses.

But a funny thing happened on my way to the Hill. The administrator got wind of it and he called my immediate boss and he said, "under no circumstances is Clark to go up to the Hill." This boss, Bill Strong, said, "How can we prevent it? The Hill has asked for him." The administrator said, "He can't leave here. You have got to declare him indispensable." And my boss, Bill, said, "How can I declare him indispensable when you required me to give him an official rebuke and to cancel his travel and indicate to him that he may no longer use the secretarial staff?"

It was time to work out a transfer, and I did.

After one of these blockages I soon maneuvered myself into another program instituted by the White House. It provided that specialists in various departments could be loaned to the programs helping the American Indians.

Now, the same approach - a self-help supervised loan program was needed among Indians. This transfer appealed to me a great deal, because Indian tribes are, legally, nations. So I could pursue an inter nation program without going outside America. I could do it right here in the USA with the tribes. So I moved the Indian Program in the Executive Office of the President.

In this Indian program, I pursued four different approaches: one would be a bank at the tribal level; a central bank at the Washington level; an investment company for Indian tribes run out of Washington; and the final one would be an American Indian Development Bank (AIDBANK). The latter was my main interest, but it was the one I did not have time to complete. The other three institutions, however, did become a reality.

This Indian program was under the auspices of the White House. It was a very fortunate move for me. It enabled me to prove the basic doctrine that I had learned from my mentor, M. L. Wilson. His idea was that when you have a good idea you start at the lowest level; you start with a small program and you prove that it is successful and viable. It may take years of hard work, as he told me, but in the end somebody will pick it up. This is what actually happened to several of the programs that I worked on in their beginning phases.

This Indian development program was started at the very lowest levels of tribal organization. I located at a very small tribe near Yuma, Arizona. There, I proceeded to further develop the plans that I had already been working on. Most Indians didn't know anything about finance, most had never been in a bank. So I made an appointment at the Bankers Association of Arizona. I made arrangements to have members of the Indian community meet with representatives of the Arizona Bankers Association. The meeting was held in the boardroom of the Bankers Association of Arizona. It was a very successful meeting. Indians were anxious to move ahead and the banking community was anxious to cooperate.

Out of this effort came the American Indian National Bank. I attended the opening ceremony. The new president of the bank had just left the position as president of Phillips Petroleum Company. He was the Principal Chief of the Cherokee Indian Tribes.

The investment program, a different program, was an immediate success. I made contact with an old school tie at Harvard, Gabriel Hauge, who then was president of the Manufacturers Hanover Trust Bank in New York. Indians were only getting four percent on their deposits, which were many hundreds of millions of dollars. I had been over and checked with the Internal Revenue Service and found a very warm reception. Being completely surprised at such favorable and cordial treatment from the IRS, which was supposed to be made up of "bad" people, I asked: "What goes on here?" And the lady said, "I am a member of the Cherokee tribe." We had very cooperative service from the IRS.

The Treasury Department restored control of finance to the tribes. This in itself was a kind of decentralization, very much in keeping with the whole theory that I was pursuing.

This was all done while I was on loan from the Department of State. It is perhaps important to be stated because it perhaps proves the case. There are perhaps unlimited opportunities for decentralizing government functions and placing more responsibilities in the hands of the people at the grassroots.

The Point Four program was less receptive to this "bottoms-up" approach than it had been in the very beginning, when President Truman took a personal interest in it, and when the land-grant colleges played a major role, and people like Stanley Andrews were at the helm.

The whole nature of the program had changed. In the beginning the Point Four leaders indicated that the program could be run with very little funds, with teachers and specialists working through local organizations overseas and forming organizations where they did not exist. They would pass on the know-how and the techniques that we had developed in America. At the initial Congressional hearing, Dr. Bennett, administrator of the Point Four program, indicated that it would just take a matter of a few millions to get this program underway and operating. We were not talking in terms of billions, not about armies, and national defense, such as, for example, the solution of the war between Egypt and Israel, where great sums of money were put into supporting up the economies of these two countries.

Stanley Andrews regretted this change to high spending very much, as he indicated in a letter to me dated November 20, 1980. He described the program of being "more a management of money, rather than a catalyst to help people help themselves," and I am alarmed at what is happening now, where the abundance of money is introducing high technology while the basic needs of people - food and health - are way down the list in priority.

The nature of the program change is indicated in a rather amusing incident in which President Truman called Stanley Andrews into his office and indicated that he was to be the new head of the Point Four program. Stanley Andrews was aghast, and he stumbled out these words: "Mr. President, I have recommended at least six people who would bring immediate distinction to this job. I am only an apple-knocker from Arkansas." He said, "That's what I told FDR when he wanted me to be Vice President."

[This is an off-the-record explanation. In the next segment I am going to go back and outline some of the steps that took place at the very beginning of the Point Four program.]

Certainly, the most interesting part of a program such as Point Four is at the very beginning. This is the period of innovation, when new paths are being broken. When I moved from the Department of Agriculture to the Point Four program, the roster of the Point Four program was contained on one page of names. Programs were being formulated. There was always the excitement of something new. Under M.L. Wilson, the great innovator of New Deal programs, who was in the Department of Agriculture when I first entered government, innovation was the order of the day. I used to make the statement that the best time to enter a program is at the very beginning, even before the furniture has arrived. Even before a routine has settled in, and certainly before the lawyers had taken over.

My first assignment in the Point Four program was to be head of the Education Section. Programs of assistance were to be formulated for colleges in Cairo; in Greece; in Beirut, Lebanon; and in Thailand.

In a new program you do not know what is expected, you do not know the time demands on different programs. Cy Fryer put his head in the door of my office one time, and he asked, "Are you going to be able to get those programs written up in time?" There were four of them. I said, "Yes, sir, I'll have them for you." He looked a little incredulous and he said, "Well, that will allow you about a half an hour per program." I answered, "I'll have them ready."

I had not yet learned that there was a three-year budget cycle, and that before programs are launched there are often studies that go the route of the budget cycle. I had been thinking in terms of the kind of programs and decisions that you knock out on the spot in the military. Some of this rapid-fire decision making was commonplace in the first days of the New Deal program.

It is notable that these first college contract programs were, in all but one case, in the Near East; and this is where the incursions of the Red Army, the Russians, had taken place. This was where the threat to world peace was considered to lie.

It was important to do something immediately; things that were visible and things that would help the people. Iran seemed to be given primary attention, and very early on there was a program to transport baby chicks to Iran, in order to raise the quality of poultry. The chickens in Iran were of poor quality. The improvement of poultry and livestock is something that can be done almost immediately. The new Iran office made some telephone calls and made arrangements to ship 5,000 chicks to Iran to be delivered to what would be the Department of Agriculture. This proved to be very successful. Of the 5,000 chicks that we ordered, they counted 5,020 live chicks that had arrived.

One rather strange initial program was to send donkeys to Iraq. They were sent by airplane. I believe also that goats were sent to Iraq. Because of advances that have been made since that time, one would now implant the embryos in a rabbit and ship the rabbit by airplane, and then remove the embryos and implant them in native livestock, giving the advantage of the immunities that have been developed in the indigenous country and also the genes of improved stock from America.

The thing I remember most from those initial days was the high esprit de corps, the enthusiasm that people had for this new idealistic program.

I remember somebody being asked where they were going to take their vacation. And the answer was, "where could I go on vacation where I would enjoy it as much as I enjoy this program?" The dedication of the staff was indicated when just before Christmas, when Dr. Bennett, the former president Oklahoma State University was killed, along with all his staff who accompanied him, as they landed in Tehran. The memorial service was a very moving event, and it brought the entire staff together in a feeling of mutual sorrow and dedication to the high ideals of the Point Four program.

As we went into the holiday season, the staff began to wonder who the next administrator would be. We did not have to wait long for an answer. Prompt action was required because Administrator Bennett's arrangements had been made to circle the world in setting up world wide offices for the basis of the Point Four program. It was soon indicated that Stanley Andrews had been selected as the man to complete this trip that had been scheduled for Mr. Bennett. I was personally delighted at this appointment, because I had known the work of Stanley Andrews in Europe, as a member of General Eisenhower's staff at Supreme Headquarters. He had been in charge of food and agriculture. I was frankly very surprised but very pleased when Cy Fryer called me in and said that I had been selected to accompany Stanley Andrews on this trip.

The unusual circumstance under which Stanley Andrews came to be appointed the Point Four administrator are related by him in a letter to him dated November 20, 1980. He writes of the occasion of the 80th birthday celebration honoring President Truman. He was at a meeting at a memorial celebration in Independence, Missouri, where he was the main speaker, along with Averell Harriman. Stanley Andrews had written: "When Dr. Bennett and his staff were killed in an air accident in Tehran on Christmas Eve, 1951, I was head of the office of Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA. I had worked with Dr. Bennett in developing the philosophy of Point Four, which after a lot of bureaucratic argument had set a goal of attacking the three basic enemies of mankind - disease, hunger, and illiteracy. I was in Arkansas on a duck hunt when they called me to return to Washington, pronto. This I did, and the State Department asked me to follow Dr. Bennett's itinerary and try to find out what he had promised. It was sort of a special mission. When I returned I was appointed Acting Head of Point Four. One morning I got a call from Dawson at the White House, who asked me to come over because, 'the boss wants to see you.' I asked what about, and he said 'Point Four.' I gathered up some pictures and some notes and went into the White House. A bunch of newspapermen were sitting in the press room. Dawson had warned me not to say anything when I came. Mr. Truman was at his desk reading a bunch of papers and looking up as I reported to him, he said, 'Well, a couple of my cabinet members were here this morning, and they tell me you are the man to head the Point Four.' Shocked a little, I said, 'My God, Mr. President, I have recommended at least six people who would bring immediate distinction to this job. I'm only an Arkansas apple-knocker.' He said, 'that's what I told FDR when he wanted me to be Vice President, and look at me now. I want you to run that outfit like you own it. Don't ask a man his politics, his religion, or his color, but get people who can do the job. If I am ever remembered 50 years after I'm dead, it will be because my name was connected with this program. If you are faced with making decisions which may embarrass you, tell me what they are and I'll make them for you.' With that mandate I went out of the office walking on air. Several times, Congressmen put pressure on me to appoint some bum to a soft job and a big salary. I usually said, 'Talk to the boss about that.' Truman never once allowed any of his people to put pressure to appoint anyone. I guess Point Four was sort of an impossible dream. We had few successes and many failures, but I'm happy that we tried."

There was very little time to make any preparations. We got on the plane and headed for New York, where Stanley Andrews did a bit of shopping. He purchased a Homburg hat and this self-styled apple-knocker from Arkansas made his debut as a diplomat of ambassadorial rank. I also had some purchases to make. I bought my hat in Rome, a Borsalino. I needed shoes, which I bought in Beirut. I was very surprised at the vagaries of international finance when I found that I could buy a fine pair of first-class dress shoes in Beirut cheaper than I could get them in the United States.

We flew first to Rome. Underway I was very pleased to note that Stanley had selected some fine literature to read, and I noted further that he was a "rapid reader." We stopped in Rome and visited with United Nations agricultural officials there, and then on to Malta, and then on to the countries along the Southern Rim of the Mediterranean. It is very interesting that the adaptation that the local peoples had made to the battles that had raged in Northern Africa. One of the big industries there is arts and crafts, and we noted with interest that some of the fine specimens they were turning out were glistening metal, but if you looked on the inside of the object you would see that it was formerly a Coca-Cola can.

We saw interesting experiments in planting special kinds of grasses that would thrive in desert soil and tie them down and keep the soils from blowing. This spread of the desert was to be checked. There were experiments in water development. We saw a rather fancy contraption on a well where a donkey going back and forth was pulling both directions and would draw more water than formerly. It was a fine presentation. But on closer scrutiny they confessed that this was really something to impress visitors. It really hadn't improved on the old method.

The same was true over in Egypt, where we had some experts in housing tell us that they had developed "new" building materials. At the conclusion of this discussion it could be summed up. What we are finding here from these experiments was that Nile mud, mixed in with some straw, makes a good building block and the more straw the better. Nothing new under the sun. Moses, where are you?

It may come as a surprise that the country that impressed me the most, and I think the same is true for Stanley Andrews, was Libya "the pariah nation." Here was a country that could boast only 18 college graduates. It had been under the thumb of colonialism and had been exploited to the point that one wondered if it ever could rise. We went into the headquarters building, not a terribly large place, where the president of the country and his staff were terribly busy, terribly active and absorbed in what they were doing. We were not able to take very much time with the president. He was far behind in the race for modernization and he wanted to waste no time. We visited some of the schools, and we were very much impressed. They were manned by competent teachers who were refugees from Palestine. They had lost their own country and they were in Libya teaching accounting and typing and other skills. They made a very fine impression on us as to their competence and their demeanor and their general fine appearance and production.

The next stop was Jordan. And our visit here was a memorable one. We had some time to while away prior to meeting someone with the name of Musa Al-Alami, a name that I had never heard but would never again forget.

While we were in the public square I stepped out of the car, thinking to purchase some oranges. There was a move by some hostile men standing around the market place. They moved menacingly in my direction; and there suddenly appeared some plain-clothes detectives who headed them off. They warned me and Stanley, "You'd better get in that car for your own self-protection." We were still in the aftermath of the Israeli-Palestinian war, and there was much bitterness. There were refugee camps in many places that we encountered. As we contemplated the bitterness and the wounds that lay strewn along the road to Jericho.

I made a statement to Stanley Andrews that really was a prologue to some of the work that I would be doing for many years, even to this day. I told Stanley, "the problem that is faced here cannot be solved by the State Department, it can be solved by the Quakers." Part of my indoctrination into the Department of Agriculture under the tutelage of M. L. Wilson, was to visit some of the Quaker work camps for youth and become acquainted with the great Quaker leader Clarence Pickett. The Quakers had the reputation that in a wartime situation they could be trusted as humanitarians by opposing armies and that they could be very effective. Even before Stanley Andrews and I started this trip there was in the back of my mind the kind of a solution that I had learned from the social service innovators in the Department of Agriculture. It was a solution which private voluntary agencies, particularly the rural church groups, could do very effectively. And I had already thought that there should be some sort of special organizational arrangement to make full use of this great reservoir of American talent on an international basis.

After encountering hatred on the road to Jericho, we next visited the project of the Arab Development Society. Musa Bey Alami was president of the Arab Development Society and he directly managed this project. Musa Alami was Father Flanagan, Mother Theresa and Dr. Livingston all rolled up into one. When asked why his work with orphans was so successful he had a single straight-forward answer: I give them love and affection. We held a conference standing beside a beautiful flowing well and a large cement swimming pool. It was the delight of orphan boys that he had taken under his care. It was an Arab Boys' Town.

Musa had figured something out that no one had figured out in all preceding centuries: namely, that there had to be underground water. Based on the calculations he had made on evaporation of the Dead Sea there had to be water.

Stanley Andrews and I had already been talking about the value of setting up an international voluntary agency that would work in cooperation with the Point Four program. But how do you start? It is absolutely essential that you find good local leadership. I was amazed, standing by that well, listening to Musa Alami tell about the wonderful work he had been doing in rescuing discarded orphans. Young boys who were hopelessly stranded and living by begging and stealing. He had taken them in and was in the process of making successful men out of them. I stood by this flowing well watching him and wondering: he's either crazy or he's one of the greatest men I'd ever seen. Musa is a very sensitive person, and I detected then that he was self-conscious about my careful scrutiny of him. Seventeen years later he recalled that incident in detail -including the size of the turnip he was cutting up and handing to us all. He remembered the conversation of that time.

If you read Senator Humphrey's bill introducing the Peace Corps legislation you will discover this orphanage of Musa Bey Alami became the model and point of beginning for the formation of International Voluntary Services, Inc., the prototype to the Peace Corps.

As we proceeded from Jordan on to Lebanon, Iran, Iraq, Egypt, India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, we carried on discussions about how the marvelous work of this great Arab leader might be built upon and become an adjunct to the Point Four program.

In Amman, we had dinner at the official residence of Ambassador Cavendish Cannon. He brought a little reality to the situation. He had been bombed several times. He had also been bombed in Yugoslavia, and he was now ranked as the most bombed diplomat in the Foreign Service. There was also at this dinner a young staff member who had been a journalist and actually had worked for Stanley Anderson under his editorship at a newspaper in Arkansas.

It seemed that wherever we went on this trip we ran into Americans who were manning Agricultural positions - some for the United States and some for the United Nations. I should have realized that Stanley Andrews was in the Department of Agriculture and Foreign Agricultural Service. This agency was, in a sense, a predecessor to the Point Four program. Agricultural specialists we met along the way would soon be transferred to Point Four, just as Andrews, himself, had transferred. It was a version of the County Agent program. The county agents, both in the U.S. and overseas, were dispensing information on the latest developments and research from the land grant college system, and they were out demonstrating. Not only that, if you looked very far you would also see the hand of M. L. Wilson, the man described as "the most innovative mind in the New Deal." This man's mind was everywhere, and some of the technicians we met along the way were simply people that he had brought in and sent abroad to accomplish good purposes.

We traveled from Jericho, West Bank, to Beirut, where we listened to a presentation by a Dr. Cannon, a livestock specialist from the university at Urbana, Illinois, but of the same Utah family as Cavendish Cannon who was ambassador to Jordan. I had been in university with close relatives of both of these men.

We next flew to Baghdad. In Iraq it was Texas A&M that had center stage. A very well-known and highly regarded expert in poultry had studied at Texas A&M and knew the land grant college system in the United States. He was our guide and took us to poultry installations that were as modern as you would find anywhere. We could not, for example, even get into where the chickens were before we put our feet through a solution of disinfectant.

There was something that happened in Baghdad of significance that I was unaware of at the time. While at the hotel, I called by telephone a friend of mine from Columbia University by the name of Hamid Khadem. He had a cousin, Mohammed Nasir, also living at International House, they were the two Iraqi boys there. We became very close friends. If someone in passing at the main lobby of the International House were to tell me, "your cousins were looking for you," I would know exactly what was meant. Khadem came down to the hotel and we had a very, very fine reunion. This was being observed by Stanley Andrews. I was told sometime later that he had made a speech - in which he had said that when he traveled on this visit around the world he had traveled with a friend who had lived in an International House and that most anywhere he went he could pick up the phone and call old friends, sometimes, now prominent in the government, would come down and spend an enjoyable hour or so. He made this statement in connection with his advocacy of a program to give increased funding to student exchanges.

We next went to India. We there found there that Ambassador Bowles was making a great reputation for himself and was bringing great honor to America. The issue as to whether overseas personnel should form little enclaves with their own schools and their own society was answered by Ambassador Bowles in this way: he saw to it that his children attended the regular school with the native children and did other typically American actions which made him very beloved by the people.

If you're talking about American impact on India, you're really talking Horace Holmes. Horace Holmes had been sent to India by Foreign Agriculture Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, as a community development officer. This was done following a visit of Nehru to Washington, DC on which he conferred with M. L. Wilson. And it was agreed at that time that part of the revival in India should contain the community development program approach that M. J. Wilson had followed in the New Deal days. As you will note, there were dust bowls and great poverty which uprooted people, there was the Tennessee Valley Authority which caused people to move, this destroyed communities and the concern among sociologists and church leaders was how to restore this feeling of community which had been destroyed. It had much wider applications, also. This need was advanced by M. L. Wilson, who was really at the heart of these New Deal programs dealing with dust bowl and migration.

M. L. Wilson had told me about his talk with Nehru and asked me if I would accept the assignment to go over and join Nehru's program as a community development advisor. Actually, I accepted and was awaiting the processing of my papers. They have bureaucracy, too, in India, and I had been waiting a long, long time. I thought the matter had been forgotten, but the appointment came through. However, I had already joined the Armed Forces and was no longer available.

So I could look at Horace Holmes in India and say to myself, but for the fact of bureaucratic delay, there stand I. I was very, very impressed by Horace Holmes' work and almost glad that I hadn't accepted, because as I saw him in action I thought he was putting on a performance that I could not have duplicated.

Let me illustrate. Holmes drove us down to Agra, the town where the Taj Mahal is located. We went out to the metal square and there were a number of people standing around talking in groups. One of the Indians came up to me and told me, "what you're seeing never could have happened earlier." They were participating in their own government affairs. "We now regard that government as our friend, and we are engaged in each other in working out our own problems," he said. He portrayed this as sort of a revolution at the grass roots in India. This is precisely what this program was supposed to accomplish. It was what M. L. Wilson was pushing in America. His theory was that yes, there must be New Deal programs; there have to be controls and uniform standards issued from Washington, but in order that the democratic balance be maintained, there must be action by the people.

Control exerted at the center must be counterbalanced by local control and participation at the grass roots.

In order to keep the ship of state on even keel, there was devised in the U.S. Department of Agriculture a whole system of grass roots committees in many fields - in extension service, in farm security, resettlement, soil conservation, youth programs and many other fields. Taken together these various devices were given the name Economic Democracy in Agriculture. An effort was now being made, in connection with International Voluntary Services, to utilize this grass roots strength that had been developed in American and make it available in overseas programs. It was the view that the best way to put the private sector to work would be to cooperate with the efforts of faith-based voluntary groups and other local organizations.

In New Delhi, I had a reunion with another friend from International House in New York. His name was Krishnalal Shridharani and he was married to a very famous dancer. I was able to observe that, like other of my friends from International House he was keeping very good company. He took me into a luncheon in progress, to meet his wife and his wife's friend. His wife's friend happened to be Indira Gandhi.

In Pakistan, there was an effort being made to introduce a program of the USDA Extension Service into Pakistan. We sat in a little instruction meeting and there was an Extension Service man from a land-grant college in America. He was using the same charts and the same explanations in Pakistan that he would have heard in Iowa or Indiana or Montana. I wondered just a little as to how directly transferable the United States model would be to Pakistan.

Next we go to Afghanistan. We were now right up against the Russian border. And the critical nature of the political situation was revealed in a dinner which we had in the home of the President of Afghanistan. Realizing that a new aid program was opening up, he wanted to make sure that his country was able to make the best use of it possible. Stanley had been given some instructions just to meet this situation that was bound to come up. The United State's position was this: if we were to give aid to Afghanistan in the way of grants or otherwise, it would be a red flag to the Russians. The Russians would object and could cause complications. The President had what he thought was a better idea. He said simply, "You give us the money and let us worry about the Russians." An amusing incident happened at the dinner table conversation.

Perhaps Stanley, the apple-knocker from Arkansas and myself, the onion-grower from Davis County, were not fully up on the niceties of diplomatic discourse. The conversation tended to drift to our experiences at Supreme Headquarters. I checked this by bringing the President back into the conversation and Stanley Andrews also revived to redirect conversation. He said to the President, "Have you ever had any military experience?" The President responded, "I am the commander-in-chief of the armed forces of this country."

We were both fascinated by this wild country and with the ride through the Khyber Pass back to Peshawar. There was a little footnote on the differences between customs and culture. As our car went through the Khyber Pass, we ran into the strange situation of a woman walking alone on the mountain road. Stanley Andrews and I, the two Westerners, said immediately, "This lady's in trouble, we must stop and give her a ride." The driver of our car was vehement. Excitedly, he made it clear that under no circumstances should a male driver stop and pick up a woman even though she was alone in the Khyber Pass.

The people we passed along the way stations along the Khyber Pass were friendly, we admired them very much. On one stop, there were warriors carrying these long, old-fashioned rifles that you would see in a 1920s movie. I challenged one of them and we grappled madly for possession of his rifle. It looked a struggle to the death. A lot of onlookers took some pictures of this mad scene. The Afghans loved it, and so did I.

As we traveled eastward, we could not get out of our minds the significance of what we had seen at the Musa Bey Alami Boys Town project near Jericho. By the time we had reached Afghanistan, it was decided that I would go back to Tehran, leaving Andrews to proceed eastward around the earth. We believed that Musa's example and leadership would provide a great opportunity to begin an international volunteer program which would carry on activities somewhat similar to those that were carried on in Jericho by Musa.

Stanley and I parted in New Delhi. I got a flight that happened to be leaving in the middle of the night. This was an unusual flight, as I will explain. The flight from New Delhi entered Iran and stopped at a small desert airstrip. There was no gas pump and only a small hut for shelter. Ten-gallon rectangular cans of gasoline were stacked up; that was the method of refueling. As it just began to get light, a large group of Arabs approached over the desert, talking enthusiastically, in a very celebratory mood. They were bringing to the airplane a visiting spiritual leader. I had heard of such a leader; they knew about him in Tehran. I have thought it was Khomeini, but I can't be sure. In any case, on arriving in Tehran I was told to make a report on this unusual personality.

As the desert Bedouins gathered around the plane, I got out and got as close as I could to study this interesting scene and celebration. Suddenly someone appeared from out of the blue, a strapping six-and-a-half-foot American. We would say back then that he was a CIA man. He urgently warned: "You'd better get back in that plane, this is not safe for you." I hurriedly took shelter in the plane, and he disappeared back in his little cubicle back in the airstrip hut. The Moslem leader seemed to be very embarrassed when he, too, boarded the plane that a visitor could not be safe in his country, a country of great hospitality. He made friendship overtures, and came over to my seat.

I told him I was an American. He was, obviously, wondering what an American was doing up in that part of the Iranian desert in the middle of the night. I felt that I was under some scrutiny and I didn't have to tell a lie, I simply indicated that I was in Iran working in connection with the contract program of the three Utah universities. This was a good password - to have said I was a member of the State Department would not have put me in good light. It could have meant CIA. I mention that as corroboration of a view that I have held for a long time, namely, that in many countries - particularly in the Near East and in the Arab countries - the private, voluntary agencies, the grassroots people, the universities and churches, and so on, can do a much more effective job in many places.

Now back in Tehran. When I arrived alone, back in Tehran, there was work to be done. I indicated to Franklin S. Harris that Andrews and I had agreed that we wanted to build an international volunteer program using the using the Musa Bey Alami project as a beginning. Franklin Harris said, "You could put years into a project of that kind, and it could be wiped out in riots in one night." He was prophetic. We did work for years, and it was wiped out in one night. Musa Bey wrote to me and indicated that he was stopping. He was a refugee, now in Beirut, very discouraged. I wrote back and predicted that he would be back in the middle of it, and he was; and we were back helping him. Robert Neumann, former ambassador to Saudi Arabia, told me that he considered the Musa Bey Alami project to be the most outstanding and most successful development project that America had participated in overseas.

I indicated earlier that when Stanley and I were first in Tehran, it was stated through secret channels - actually through five different channels - that the Communists had decided that now would be a good time to assassinate an American. Up to this time, it could have been him; it could have been me. The case was building against us both equally. It was said that Stanley and I had arrived in Tehran to stir up a revolution or a war. Perhaps they thought this was believable because the Communists were well aware that secret agents had been in Tehran. Kermit Roosevelt was there, and other CIA agents. When I returned to Tehran from India, I was clearly ahead of Stanley. I was way out in front. This was the time when I was handed a little Communist sheet that indicated that I had given to Madame Chiang Kai-shek three million dollars.

At the time I was expecting a baby to be born. It was Jim, and I must say that I became rather thoughtful in those few days. It was a relief to get on the plane headed for the United States.

At this point I must tack on an extra paragraph which I'd overlooked. The key reason for my returning to Tehran from India was to make an official move toward setting into motion the formation of International Voluntary Services. At Tehran a meeting was called for members of the three Utah universities that were there. We met at the residence of Franklin S. Harris. The purpose was to discuss the future of voluntary non-government agencies. The universities people were under salary. The thing was set up as kind of a party and everyone was there having a good time, but we did settle down to business. We went into a side room, a library there, and we discussed the business at hand. I made a resolution, which was accepted and passed, that there be formed a voluntary services project, using as a point of departure the outstanding work of Musa Bey Alami. When I returned to America I wrote a letter to Musa and I wrote a letter to M. L. Wilson, whom I also visited. I told both of them, "You are two men who are so much alike that you should get to know each other." M. L. Wilson was taking a trip abroad on behalf of the Ford Foundation. He was helping the Ford Foundation develop its program, and he welcomed the opportunity to meet Musa. After he met Musa he gave his report to me in one sentence. He said to me, "Musa is a great man." Later, when we put together the Jericho project, which was the first modern dairy in that part of the world, the Ford Foundation provided one million dollars at one time. The cattle and personnel and so on were arranged at the Davis County Bank in Farmington, Utah, a bank at which, at that time I had become the chief executive officer.

The significant thing, then, is that when we started this project, International Voluntary Services, it was not started with government money. It was started with private money and once some private money had been put together, big organizations like the Ford Foundation were willing to give it a boost.

After I returned to Washington from this trip with Stanley Andrews, I transferred to the International Development Advisory Board, which had just been reorganized by Nelson Rockefeller and was now under the direction of Eric Johnston, a very dynamic leader who had been head of the National Manufacturers Association, and was at that time head of the Motion Picture Association of America. This was the ideal location from which to build a voluntary, overseas, youth program.

Building an organization is a bit like the manufacture of an automobile - one simply assembles a number of completed parts that others have developed. And so it was with IVS. Many of the church organizations had carried on very successful voluntary organizations, particularly in that period immediately after the war, when there was much destruction. Animal herds had been destroyed. Agrarian, rural groups, such as the Mennonites and the Quaker Brethren and the Mormons had carried on programs abroad. They had the organization and they had the right attitude. What was needed was an interdenominational approach and adaptation to the needs of Point Four. In the first meeting with these groups, I asked them directly if they were in a position to work together, with other church groups, and other socially-minded non-church groups and if they would be able to divest themselves of denominationalism. In other words, could they work together as Americans. This, of course, was a foolish question; they had already been doing this, Heifer Project was an example. We agreed that there had to be an organizational mechanism. This offered no problem. I merely took a copy of the Near East Foundation charter and held it in my left hand and wrote a new charter with a pencil in my right hand.

In some areas, churches were working together, but didn't know about working with a government. This problem of relating the private sector to the public sector met resistance from both sides. There were strong feelings, and have been for hundreds of years, all through the rise of Western civilization, that it's the relationship between church and state. Cy Fryer and I went in to talk to the general counsel, Phillip Glick. We outlined the

The New Deal revolution began with dust bowl and farm problems. It was best exemplified in rural America under the leadership of the Department of Agriculture. In fighting destruction of the dust bowl and the problems of migratory population, church groups became allies and partners with government. This was particularly true of those religious groups that had rural and communitarian traditions. These groups were clearly defined in the minds of the innovative social planners in the Department of Agriculture headed by Under Secretary M. L. Wilson. (Sensibly, he refused a "promotion" to Secretaryship when it was offered him. He was Plato's "philosopher king" and he liked it and wanted to stay that way.) The so-called rural groups were the Brethren, the Mennonites, the Mormons and the Quakers. There were, of course, many others, but these four made a good place to begin because they were already recognized and had been working together. They could do a job that needed to be done. When Stanley Andrews and I felt threatened at the Jericho market place, and when we contemplated the fury of Arab-Israeli animosity, I stated to Andrews: "what needs to be done here, the government can't do, but the Quakers can." The Quakers served as a euphemism for all organizations that represented the moral nature of man, rather than the political motivations. Thus was that a government man came together with a group of leaders of church programs and with an expenditure of \$2.30 - a corporation was formed. This \$2.30 covered the outlay for the organization International Voluntary Services, prototype for the Peace Corps.

Now, there are two systems coming together here: the city of man and the city of God. This is not entirely simple. Theologians and monarchs have wrangled about this since the beginning of time. The question is where you draw the line, and how can they be brought into a harmonious relationship. There are inherent difficulties, and these difficulties are illustrated in the agony and ecstasy of pure creativity, in poem or bureaucracy. It required eight years. Let us review steps taken to launch the voluntary program of International Voluntary Services. A few of these steps will now be outlined.

The first question we faced was this: will the United States Government, namely the Point Four program, work together with a non-profit organization made up of church groups? Even before a charter had been drawn up, the matter was taken before the General Counsel, Mr. Phillip Glick. The General Counsel made it very clear that this was against policy, and he put forth several good reasons. After this rather extended conference, Cy Fryer and I left the room, and the first thing that was said just after the door was closed was this: "Phil Glick knows that I will pay exactly no attention to anything he has told us." This meant of course that the projects that we would launch would receive no government funding, and this was the way it should have been. The private sector was challenged to prove that it could get started with no government money whatsoever. And after four of these projects were done, that is in Egypt; in Jericho, Jordan; in Iraq; and Kurdistan, it was then decided by Point Four that these projects were of such merit that they were counted as partners with government, and thereafter they served as a citizens' voluntary arm of the Point Four Overseas Program. Prior to this time, the only notable exception to government programs was some humanitarian projects worked out in connection with the Friends Services Committee.

There was another hurdle to be surmounted in bringing together into the same team government and private groups. This was the fact that the church groups often wanted nothing to do with government programs. The opposition to cooperation was not always openly expressed, but it was subtle and it was pervasive. This demanded some scheming. It was observed that in the early programs, advisors had been brought in in various capacities, and some of these were church representatives. Most notably, John Reisner, head of Agricultural Missionaries, Inc. He had had extensive experience in China in church welfare and humanitarian programs. Agricultural Missions was an interdenominational service organization headquartered in New York. It had become obvious that John Reisner was the man others looked to for a sign. He was the leader. It seemed obvious that nothing could happen until we dealt with John Reisner. Accordingly, I got Ben Bushong to join me in a visit to New York to call on John Reisner. I introduced the subject by pointing to this impasse, this issue of the role of church and state. I indicated my view that John Reisner had not got the right information and was not judging correctly. I told Bushong: "This organization, IVS, is not going to turn a wheel until you can convince John Reisner that he should join up. You go get him I'm going to sit in this chair in this corner until you do." Ben Bushong, the Lancaster County farmer, took in after John Reisner, this sophisticated Director of Worldwide programs, and he did a first-class job on John Reisner. Reisner became the President of International Voluntary Services and he was a great leader.

John Reisner continued to be the arbiter of issues concerning church and state. To further clarify the issue, it was decided that there should be a conference between government spokesmen and the spokesmen for the voluntary agencies. This was to be held under the auspices of the International Development Advisory Board, headed by Eric Johnston, who answered directly to the President of the United States.

I made certain that this confrontation would not take place on government territory. The conference was held in the headquarters of the Motion Picture Association of America, of which Eric Johnston was now the President. The man who dominated the government scene at that time demanded that he have the center role and be the keynote spokesman. He wanted to tell 'em like it is. To this ambitious official this was going to be a government thing, even though it was carefully arranged to be on Eric Johnston's private property. Eric Johnston, the dashing leading man of the Motion Picture Association of America, alighted from his white charger, made a few introductory remarks, and turned it over to the leading man from government. He began this way, "We are here today to determine if there might be a role in international programs for the voluntary agencies." John Reisner was a tweedy, pipe-smoking sweet philosopher type who, with a smile on his face could guillotine you with a feather. Smilingly he corrected that bureaucratic interloper. "We are here," he said pleasantly, "to see if there is a role for government."

In 1952, the program of International Voluntary Services now seemed to be off to a good start. The charter was recorded in 1953. The first president who served for a short time, gave enormous prestige, he was head of the International Refugee Organization. His name was William Hallam Tuck, close friend of Herbert Hoover. John Reisner succeeded him and filled another valuable niche. He was the arbiter of where the line should be drawn between that which is Caesar's and that which is God's. The International Development Advisory Board was initially the nominal sponsor. International Voluntary Services was its spearhead program. It was at the IDAB that the IVS policy statement was written. It was titled, "Testing the People to People Approach." Seven years later Senator Hubert Humphrey introduced the Peace Corps legislation. His staffers made a study of the experience of IVS. There was only this one program statement: Testing the People to People Approach. All the rest of the paperwork consisted of action papers.

Dr. Franklin S. Harris was the first to agree to serve on the Board of Directors. This broke the ice. Dr. Carl C. Taylor, noted rural sociologist was the second. A number of my former associates in the rural welfare programs at the Department of Agriculture joined the IVS board, also several college presidents and, of course, representatives of church groups.

The organizing group - Quaker, Brethren, Mennonite and Mormon - saw themselves as an organizing "preparatory committee" and later as staff, and they did not initially serve on the board. Later, they all served as board members and active leaders as the overseas projects spread to about forty countries.

There was an ideological difference in International Voluntary Services which received notice in the press. This is the fact that in the beginning, IVS made use of a number of conscientious objectors. You may assume that this met some opposition, some references to IVS being a collection of draft-dodgers. One of the officials of an anti-war peace group rather chided me on one occasion because I was not a conscientious objector, and that I believed in enlisting. There was an obvious answer for those of us who had been in uniform. A country that will allow freedom of conscience and that will allow its young men to be conscientious objectors, is a country worth fighting for. When the Vietnam War began, IVS volunteers were the front line of the military effort in that country. Although they did not serve in a military capacity, they had a vital role in what was needed. They were in jungles and mountain areas waging the battle for the minds and hearts of the local people. They were teachers back in mountain villages which were nearly inaccessible to other Americans. Their casualties in the war were said by some to approach the casualties as those in the military. I attended the funeral of one IVS-er, who had been shot while he was out in front of a column of soldiers. He was acting as a guide.

There was another issue that had to be faced; the issue of youth versus age. There was at the very beginning a consultant named Dr. S. McKee Rosen. He was a professor at American University in the field of public administration. He seemed to be a champion of professional men should be hired for these administrative positions. When IVS was first being discussed, he confronted us on this issue. Anticipating his move, I brought in about three of my associates whom I thought could stand up very well to him on this issue. Dr. Rosen came right to the point. "I hear you are hiring for your programs young kids, 22 years old, to represent America abroad." "No," I said, "Jim Baile is 24 years old." "Okay, what can a 24-year old kid do?" At this point, Dr. Glen Taggart, then with the Foreign Agricultural Service spoke up. He said quietly but devastatingly, "I sold my herd of cattle when I was 18 years of age and went out of the business to go on a mission for my church." Taggart had volunteered for a church mission. Dr. Rosen looked around and took in the scene. He knew immediately that he had been had. I had stacked the meeting with four friends of mine who were all young Utah farmers who had given years of voluntary service. We heard no more trouble from Mickey Rosen.

I had indicated earlier that there was a mind-set in government about the abilities of young people. The idea of a Youth Corps was, to almost everybody, unthinkable. It had to be demonstrated. IVS was making that demonstration. Almost everyone in the administration could rattle off the same three reasons why it was absurd to think that youth could make a contribution, and the reasons were all rattled off in the same order. One, they would not volunteer; two, if they volunteered they could not do a good job; three, if they could do a good job it would not be accepted by these pre-industrial societies where age is revered.

There was one area where you might expect difference of opinion. The representatives from various church groups, one might expect, would see things differently. Not all do. This was a harmonious and dedicated group. There were members of the board whose church affiliations were, then and now, unknown to me. It simply didn't matter. The issue never came up.

If we were to take a bird's-eye view of this IVS program, this is what we would see. The program was begun in 1952. This is when the resolution was introduced in a meeting of Universities contract technicians in Tehran, Iran that there should be a non-profit program for volunteers. It would do work similar to the Musa Alami Boys Town for orphans near Jericho, Jordan. In 1960, the experiment was still plodding along. M. L. Wilson had told me what to expect. Revolutions are not made with atomic bombs, but with a few acorns. He had said, you will have to work hard, you will face moments of great discouragement. There will be times you will be sorry you ever thought of getting into this thing, and there will be times when you want to give it all up. But just hold on. You have a good idea. Sometime, someone will come along and pick it up and go with it. That someone was John F. Kennedy. Nine days before the election of 1960, John F. Kennedy heard about it, and grabbed it. He gave a speech launching the idea of the Peace Corps, at the Cow Palace speech in San Francisco. He took a plane and arrived in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Sam Hayes and 1,000 young men were there saying, "We're ready to go."

It is said that John Kennedy knew right away that he had happened upon the best issue of his campaign. Nine days later, when the election came, he won by less than one percent of the electorate. Could this most popular of issues, the Peace Corps - his signature contribution - have made the difference?

I left the government between the years 1954 and 1964. By then, my efforts had been directed toward self-help financing, that is to say, a supervised loan program. It was a variation of the Tenant Farm purchase Program. The work for which I was the messenger also entered the field of Islamic banking is the financing of projects at the Musa Bey Alami School for War Orphans at Jericho, Jordan. The former would take people who had been landless or tenant farmers, extend credit to them, provide supervision to them, and produce successful independent farm owners. Stanley Andrews and some others lent great support to this idea, but it was much too involved to be handled on a small scale. Stanley, although retired, came frequently to Washington as an advisor to Point Four. He actually headed a three-man team who made a study and gave high recommendation to this idea, and suggested that, to get it started, that Dale Clark be given a special assignment with a free hand.

I worked with the International Development Advisory Board Staff, and enjoyed the protection of this very prominent group, I nevertheless had to have very close working relationships with the Point Four program. Then at this time there came to be very many shifts in the leadership, and in bureaucratic gamesmanship that followed. I stumbled into a career landmine. Some empire-builder stepped into the office of a new administrator who had just come onto the scene. A paper signed that put me under the new administrator. Of this "fast operator," I told the administrator, "you have just put a public servant in the banking business." This could actually be regarded as beneficial. What I was trying to do, after all, was to follow the pattern of the Farm Security Administration, the Tenant Purchase Program, which was based upon supervised loans. These were the loans to the tenant farmers, the Okies who had fled to California, and were being rehabilitated and were being transformed into small farmers. Small farm ownership was the objective.

In a sense I was going back to what I had known. Just prior to my going into the military service I was the head of a farm loan finance program in California and four other western states. People learned of this program through John Steinbeck's book, *The Grapes of Wrath*. The thing I liked about this program is that it was a self-help program and it was based ultimately on private money and not public money.

How did they get the money? The old-fashioned way: they earned it. They had a 40-year loan and with land and proper supervision these dust bowl refugees the Okies - became very successful farmers. They were, supposedly, the disadvantaged. After I had left and was in military service my successor wrote to me from San Francisco: "I have just discovered who the disadvantaged are: it is you and me." He said one of our borrowers sold his wood lot for enough money to buy the whole farm. Prices were going out of sight, and people were working night shift at the Kaiser shipyards earning huge sums of money. Some of the Okies did very well.

I sought advice from some of my friends. Joan Braden said she would like to talk to Nelson Rockefeller about this. She was his administrative assistant. I indicated to him that my father, who was the head of the bank, was ill, and that I felt some pressure to go out and support him. The answer came back from Nelson Rockefeller, "Tell Dale to go out and take that job, and in six months I will send for him." Nelson Rockefeller at that time had plans to run for the presidency and he knew, as John Kennedy had learned, that the people-to-people concept was one of the finest public programs and political issues that one could find.

I went West, Rockefeller did not send for me, he was maneuvered over into a corner, as I had been in AID. The supervised loan program was a program which enlisted the local banker in the war against poverty. When I got out to the rather rural, or suburban bank, in Farmington, Utah, I found out how easy it was to become a key banker for development programs overseas. I continued my work in assisting the Musa Bey Alami project, the training school for orphans in Jericho, Jordan. Musa came to Utah. Meantime, friends of mine in the Ford Foundation had made available large sums of money to construct a dairy business which was to be manned by these new dairy people who were customers of the bank and considered by many to be the leading dairy experts in the state of Utah.

Musa said, "I want to make a large deposit in the bank." It was, for our small bank, a tremendously large deposit. I expressed my immediate gratitude and said, "Well Musa, we will give you the best rate of interest return that is legally possible." Musa recoiled at the idea. "No, I don't want any interest. No interest." I could see immediately I had made a blooper. I said, very well then, we will give you service. This we did, and the Davis County Bank had a client in Jericho, Jordan, and we were engaged in Islamic banking, and it was very rewarding for both sides.

When I returned to Washington in 1964, my first three years were with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, where I developed several financing instrumentalities for use by Indian tribes. I returned to the Point Four program, now called the Agency for International Development, in 1967. I was assigned to the Community Development function. This function had come upon hard times and was eliminated, except for one position that they saved. I occupied that position under a division headed by Clifford Matlock.

I worked out several models for self-help financing. The original founders of IVS organized a sister organization, Joint Venture Services, to work in conjunction with IVS. We even changed the name of this organization to "Self Help Works." This was a kind of Catholic ring to it, and the man who was put in as President of it was, as we used to say, "The noblest Roman of us all." He was Monsignor Edwin W. O'Rourke, who later became the Bishop of Peoria. The interesting thing is that financial experts, presidents of banks, and no less than four former presidents of the American Banking Association, grasped at the idea and thought it was splendid. But I could not sell it within the administration. Stanley Andrews had no better luck than I did. He was a constant advisor to leadership in the Point Four program, now the AID program, and at one time even headed a group, which made a study and recommended the approach that I was trying to develop.

Let me try to give you some reason for my enthusiasm in this kind of program. We had proved it to be a success. Zions Bank in Salt Lake City, had cooperated with its branch bank in Provo, Utah. This bank cooperated with customers who had volunteers in their family working in Guatemala. It was a very simple thing to arrange borrowing rights for the these young volunteers needing to erect dairies and poultry facilities among poor people in Latin America. They could receive financing via the Guatemala bank via the Provo bank simply; because a relative had to put up collateral in the Provo bank. The father and uncles and friends of these young men doing marvelous work in Guatemala were willing to do just that. The simple banking principles employed here could be blown up to massive self help programs.

Now, according to the revolutionary doctrine of M. L. Wilson, you start with one acorn. There was one acorn. So I went then to former heads of the bankers association. Bimson, Hazeltine, Smith, Mariner Eccles, and Douglas, and to the professional staff at the American Bankers Association. The bankers' association wanted the cooperation of the Senate banking committee. Legislation needed to be prepared, and I worked with several committees, including the committee of Senator Hatch. On making my rounds on Capitol Hill, I ran into a lobbyist from AID. AID was not amused, and I found myself ordered to write an account of everyone I had talked to on the Hill and everything that was discussed.

The significant thing is that AID was now in a very different type of program, with different ideals and different types of leadership. The kind of program at the beginning was now with private groups and the Peace Corps. Despairingly, Stanley Andrews had written to me in a letter dated November 20, 1980, "I guess Point Four was a sort of an impossibility. We had few successes and many failures, but I am happy that we tried."

"AID now is more the management of money, rather than a catalyst to help people help themselves, and I am alarmed at what is happening now, where the abundance of money is introducing high technology while the basic needs of people - food and health - are way down the list in priority."

Let us pause for an overview. The first program in the Point Four program was the Iran program. American technicians from universities were sent to all of the provinces in Iran. The program was popular with most Iranians. The visiting technicians found favor with the local population. They were frequently told, "You are more Muslim than we are." This was because of their habits of sobriety and modesty. Much has happened since that time, and Iran has since been classified as a pariah nation. The president of Iran, Mohammad Khatami, has directed an appeal to the American people and to the distrust between our two peoples. There is a desire for the kind of program our people started in the 1950's. Because I was head of the Iran Section of the Point Four program in that day and am now part of the American people he was addressing, I took upon myself to answer President Khatami.

I predict that something good is going to come of this. The letter to President Khatami, a copy of which will accompany this information, was answered by a telephone call from a member of the United Nations delegation from Iran. His father participated in some way in these university programs. A cordial link has been established, and discussions are being held among university people here in Utah and among the organizations who participated in International Voluntary Services.

Can voluntary agencies operate abroad separate from their government? In the vagaries of international relations there may be a place for classifying nations as pariah nations, or rogue states; but among the peace groups who were the founding element of International Voluntary Services, there is no such thing as a pariah nation. There have been pariah dictators, there may be a pariah government. Not likely a pariah state, but never would there be a pariah nation, "nation" being equated with "the people."

We have now come full circle. We started in Iran, we are now back working with Iran. I seem to hear M. L. Wilson, my mentor, advising me again: "This is a good idea. There will be many setbacks and many disappointments. There will be times when you will want to give it up and you will be sorry you ever started. But hang in there. Sometime it will be discovered and needed, and someone will come along and pick it up."

End of interview